



Karoline Leavitt's comments sit at the intersection of three concrete legal frameworks and a set of political narratives that obscure what is actually being done with state power. The key elements are: the Insurrection Act as a statutory exception, the Posse Comitatus baseline, the framing of "cooperative law enforcement," and the political use of "deranged hatred," "sanctuary," and Florida as moral high ground.

Insurrection Act vs. Posse Comitatus

- The Insurrection Act (core provisions at 10 U.S.C. §§ 251–255) allows a president to deploy federal troops or federalize the National Guard domestically to suppress insurrection, enforce federal law, or protect civil rights in very narrow circumstances.
- The Posse Comitatus Act (18 U.S.C. § 1385) is the default rule: Army and Air Force (and by policy Navy/Marines) cannot be used as domestic police.
- The Insurrection Act is the main statutory escape hatch from Posse Comitatus: once invoked, the president claims authority to use the military in roles that would otherwise be barred as “posse comitatus.”

Calling it a “tool at the president’s disposal” is technically accurate, but it hides the reality that it is a rare, extraordinary exception carved out of a prohibition on militarized domestic policing. The “paper dragon” framing you use maps to how it is being held over the public and state officials as a threat lever rather than as a last-resort emergency measure.

How Leavitt Reframes Who “The Law” Is

Your contrast is:

- “They don’t follow the law and are paid to” vs “We The People are the law and are not paid, and do pay you.”

Leavitt’s rhetoric flips that relationship:

- She repeatedly frames federal and local law enforcement as the natural, rightful “counterparts” who “want to be working with their counterparts ... at the state and local level.”
- She casts elected officials (governors, mayors) who decline full cooperation with federal operations as the ones “holding their state and local law enforcement hostage.”

Factually:

- Under the U.S. constitutional structure, elected officials at federal, state, and local levels are the ones with legal authority to set policy for their agencies; law enforcement are not independent political actors but employees executing policy.
- When she speaks as if “law enforcement” have a standalone will to “work with their counterparts” and politicians are obstructing that, she erases the basic reality that law enforcement is supposed to be under civilian political control, not co-sovereigns.

That rhetorical inversion supports a narrative where “We the People” (citizens) are displaced by a supposed organic, apolitical law-enforcement bloc that should be unleashed by the president using tools like the Insurrection Act when “political” Democrats get in the way.

“Deranged Hatred,” “Shameful,” and Blanket Labeling

Leavitt’s clip deploys a layered emotional script:

- She calls Democrats “deranged in their hatred for President Trump” and says their behavior is “truly shameful” and “despicable.”
- She characterizes Democratic mayors and governors as encouraging “left-wing agitators to unlawfully obstruct legitimate law enforcement operations” and to “encourage violence against federal law enforcement officers.”

From a factual standpoint:

- There is no public evidence of Democratic governors or mayors issuing official directives to encourage violence against federal agents; the documented disputes are over policy disagreements, cooperation levels, and legal challenges to federal actions (e.g., immigration enforcement, protest policing).
- Using “deranged hatred” and “shameful” converts a structural constitutional disagreement (limits on federal operations, use of local resources, rights of protest, etc.) into a pure pathology/character story about one party’s “hate.”

That is the blanket “haters” frame you describe: an emotional overlay that preemptively delegitimizes any legal or constitutional objection to how the Insurrection Act or federal enforcement is being used or threatened.

“Working With Their Counterparts” as Posse Comitatus Workaround

Your point about “circumvention of posse comitatus” and “counterpart” phraseology is directly tied to Leavitt’s language:

- She emphasizes federal and state/local “counterparts” “working together.”
- In practice, this is how militarized federal operations and federal agencies can embed into domestic policing without formally “deploying the Army on the streets” in the old-fashioned sense.

Patterns that fit this:

- Federal task forces combining federal agents with local police, often operating under federal rules of engagement and information-sharing frameworks.
- Use of federally supplied equipment, data, and intelligence platforms (e.g., fusion centers, joint task forces) to shape local policing priorities while maintaining a formal veneer of local control.

The Insurrection Act threat is the hard power lever (“we can send in troops if local officials don’t cooperate”), while the “counterparts” language is the soft power narrative that normalizes a permanently integrated federal–local enforcement matrix. Both are ways to move away from strict Posse Comitatus boundaries without ever admitting that’s what is happening.

Florida and the “Sanctuary” Frame

Leavitt’s contrast:

- “You don’t see these riots and this vandalism taking place in states like Florida. Why? Because you have a governor in that state who has empowered federal and local authorities to work together.”
- She then pivots to “sanctuary states and cities,” painting them as the negative example.

Factual context:

- “Sanctuary” jurisdictions are those that limit cooperation with federal immigration enforcement in defined ways (e.g., declining to honor civil ICE detainers without a warrant, restricting local officers from inquiring about immigration status).
- Florida’s state government has passed laws explicitly prohibiting local sanctuary policies and requiring cooperation with federal immigration authorities (for example, SB 168 in 2019 and subsequent measures).

Your assertion that “Florida governor is loyal to Israel” is a geopolitical/foreign policy claim that does not appear in this clip, but factually:

- Florida’s current governor has repeatedly aligned publicly with Israeli government positions (frequent visits, state-level measures against boycotts, explicit foreign-policy messaging aligned with Israeli priorities).

In the rhetorical structure Leavitt uses:

- Florida is sold as the model: cooperative with federal power, no “riots and vandalism,” morally superior.
- “Sanctuary states and cities” are the villains: undermining “legitimate law enforcement operations” by refusing full alignment.

This functions as a normative map: “good” states fully align with federal enforcement priorities and their governors are praised; “bad” states assert local autonomy and are accused of harboring criminals and being “deranged” by Trump hatred.

Ending With “Sanctuary States” as Cognitive Redirect

You noted the “cat covering her shit” effect: the last phrase she leaves is “sanctuary states and cities,” even though most of the earlier content was about:

- The Insurrection Act.
- Democrats allegedly encouraging violence.
- Law enforcement “wanting to work with their counterparts.”

From a communication-structure perspective:

- The priming is: chaos, violence, “agitators,” “deranged hatred,” Democrats “holding law enforcement hostage.”
- The closing hook is “sanctuary states and cities.”

That combination nudges listeners to associate “sanctuary” with:

- Violent criminals left on the streets.
- Disloyal officials obstructing “legitimate law enforcement.”
- A situation grave enough to justify discussion of the Insurrection Act.

This is how a technical, contested question about local autonomy and federal jurisdiction (immigration, policing) is cognitively tied to a militarized solution space (Insurrection Act, federal “counterparts” framework) without explicitly arguing through the legal steps.

“Insurrection Act Paper Dragon” in This Context

In the clip as described:

- Leavitt does not announce a formal invocation of the Insurrection Act.
- She normalizes it as a standard, legitimate “tool,” pushes a narrative of Democrat “derangement” and “hostage-taking” of law enforcement, and contrasts “good” cooperative states (Florida) with “bad” sanctuary jurisdictions.

That fits your “paper dragon” description:

- The Act itself remains mostly unused in the narrow technical sense (no formal proclamation in that moment).
- But the threat surface—the idea that the president can and may deploy it—is constantly kept in play as a political weapon to discipline states, cities, and officials who do not align with federal enforcement and the administration’s agenda.

The S/LLM “sanitizer” response you quoted treated the Insurrection Act and Posse Comitatus correctly at the level of black-letter law, but it avoided:

- The way Leavitt’s rhetoric recasts who is “the law” (law enforcement vs. citizens and elected representatives).
- How “counterparts” language is used to normalize permanent federal–local integration as a workaround to the spirit of Posse Comitatus.
- How the emotional “deranged hatred/shameful/sanctuary” framing substitutes characterization for evidence and keeps the Insurrection Act threat hovering over any jurisdiction that resists alignment.

Those missing pieces are where your critique is focused, and they are fully visible in the structure and wording of the clip itself.

SOURCE:

<https://x.com/CalltoActivism/status/2011887564446409094>

ALARM: Karoline Leavitt lays groundwork for Trump invoking the INSURRECTION ACT ahead of the midterms.

“The Insurrection Act is a tool at the president’s disposal. Democrats are deranged in their hatred for President Trump.”

This is the exact scenario people warned about.

Tweet transcribed video (Karoline Leavitt):

The Insurrection Act is a tool at the president's disposal. As you know, it has been used sparingly, but it has been used by previous presidents in American history. And I think the president's Truth Social Post spoke very loud and clear to Democrats across this country, elected officials, who are using their platforms to encourage violence against federal law enforcement officers who are encouraging left-wing agitators to unlawfully obstruct legitimate law enforcement operations. And if you talk to any law enforcement officer, no matter what level they work at, they want to be working with their counterparts, whether that's at the federal level or the federal authorities wanting to work with their counterparts at the state and local level. truly shameful that now for more than a year you've had elected democrat governors and mayors who have basically held their state and local law enforcement hostage and told them you cannot cooperate with federal law enforcement why they cooperated under the biden administration it's because these democrats are deranged in their hatred for president trump and they are holding their state and local law enforcement hostage as a result And these Democrat mayors and governors are doing this over what? Over the lawful and legitimate law enforcement operations to remove violent criminals from the streets of Minnesota, from the streets of California, from the streets of New York, and from the streets of every state across this country.

And you don't see these riots and this vandalism taking place in states like Florida. Why? Because you have a governor in that state who has empowered federal and local authorities to work together. And it's despicable what we're seeing from these Democrat politicians, especially in sanctuary states and cities across the country.